

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of NAKEISHA KAY ANDERSON,
LAQUINT LAMAR JAMES, NIEISHA RENA
JAMES, LINDSEY HARMON, and ELIGA
MARQUEZ OMARR DAVIS, JR., Minors.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

MISZ ANDERSON,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

JEROME HARRIS, ELIGA DAVIS, SR., and
LINDSEY HARMON,

Respondents.

Before: Saad, P.J., and White and Hoekstra, JJ.

PER CURIAM.

Respondent-appellant appeals by right from the juvenile court order terminating her parental rights to the minor children under MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i), (g) and (j); MSA 27A.3178(598.19b)(3)(c)(i), (g) and (j). We affirm.

We conclude from a review of the record that the trial court did not clearly err in finding that the above-referenced subsections were established by clear and convincing evidence. MCR 5.974(I); *In re Vasquez*, 199 Mich App 44, 51; 501 NW2d 231 (1993). The record shows that respondent has an extensive history of being unable to properly care for her children and to provide them with a stable home environment. The instant case commenced because respondent and the children were living in a filthy, roach-infested home with no proper heating, no food, and faulty plumbing. Respondent's sister's family of four and a brother also lived in the home, which

provided inadequate sleeping arrangements for respondent and all of the residents. Petitioner arranged for the family to go to an emergency shelter, but two days later respondent was evicted from the shelter for violating curfew rules.

Respondent has had previous encounters with petitioner because of inadequate housing, failure to provide proper medical care for some of the children, and the children's poor hygiene. Respondent has a transient, nomadic lifestyle, has a history of substance abuse (marijuana) and has not progressed in her relationship with the children. One year after the children had been removed from her care, respondent still had no adequate housing. She continued to use marijuana despite receiving treatment and counseling and she failed to adequately address her mental health issues. Respondent holds no consistent employment. Respondent failed to complete parenting classes and counseling and failed to continue consistent visitation with her children, ceasing visitations near the end of 1999. At the time of the termination hearing, respondent's whereabouts were unknown to her caseworker.

Under these circumstances, we cannot conclude that the court clearly erred in terminating respondent's parental rights to the five minor children. *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 356-357; 612 NW2d 407 (2000).

Affirmed.

/s/ Henry William Saad

/s/ Helene N. White

/s/ Joel P. Hoekstra